

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5 - 6 and 8 - 15 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 8 and 12 - 14 have been amended. Claim 7 has been canceled. New claim 15 has been added.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that item 6 of the above-identified Office Action indicated that claims 7 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicant notes that the Office Action Summary indicates that claims 12 and 13 are, likewise, allowable, while noting that claims 12 and 13 have not, otherwise, been rejected.

Additionally, Applicant's current claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 7, which was indicated as being allowable. As such, Applicant believes that claims 7, 8, 12 and 13 are actually allowable, under the Office Action. If this is somehow incorrect, Applicant requests clarification in the next Office Action, if one is found to be necessary.

Further, Applicant has amended claim 5, herein, to include all of the limitations of former claim 7, **which combination was indicated as being allowable in item 6 of the instant Office Action.** Correspondingly, claim 7 has been canceled from the

Applic. No. 09/897,279

Response Dated October 2, 2006

Responsive to Office Action of May 31, 2006

instant application. As such, Applicant's amended claim 5 is believed to be patentable for reciting, among other things:

**said respective node** wishing to synchronize with one or more others of said nodes outputting further data which identifies said respective node in a time slot assigned to said respective node after outputting the synchronization signal or receiving the synchronization signal from another one of said nodes.  
[emphasis added by Applicant]

The above limitation is believed to not be taught or suggested by the cited art. Applicant's independent claims 1 and 14 have been amended, herein, to recite a similar limitation to former claim 7, among others, and, thus, is additionally believed to be patentable over the cited art.

In item 1 of the above-identified Office Action, it was indicated that the allowability of claim 3, "now cancelled", was withdrawn. Applicant canceled claim 2 in the previous response, the allowability of which had been previously indicated. Claim 3 is currently still pending in the instant application. Additionally, the limitation of former claim 2, has been canceled from independent claims 1 and 14, to which it had been added when indicated as being allowable, and the limitation of former dependent claim 2 has been reintroduced as Applicant's dependent claim 15.

Applic. No. 09/897,279  
Response Dated October 2, 2006  
Responsive to Office Action of May 31, 2006

In item 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, and 9 - 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U. S. Patent No. 5,206,881 to Messenger et al

("MESSENGER") in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,463,646 to Dillon et al ("DILLON"). In item 4 of the Office Action, claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over MESSENGER in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,576,702 to Samoylenko ("SAMOYLENKO").

Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections, as applied to the amended claims.

More particularly, Applicant's claim 5 has been amended to include all of the limitations of former claim 7, which claim was indicated in the Office Action as being allowable. As such, it is believed that Applicant's current claim 5 is in condition for allowance.

Additionally, as stated above, Applicant's independent claims 1 and 14 have been amended to recite that, among other limitations, a respective node wishing to synchronize with one or more others of the nodes:

. . . outputting the synchronization signal and further data which identifies said respective node in a time slot assigned to said respective node after outputting the synchronization signal or receiving the synchronization signal from another one of said nodes.

Applic. No. 09/897,279  
Response Dated October 2, 2006  
Responsive to Office Action of May 31, 2006

The limitation added to amended claims 1 and 14 is the limitation found allowable in former claim 7. The subject matter is supported by the specification of the instant application, for example, by original claim 7, as well as by page 14 of the instant application, line 5 - page 15, line 3, which states:

If neither a synchronization signal nor other data are transmitted in this time period the respective node outputs a synchronization signal. The node defines internally that the starting time of the outputting of the synchronization signal is the start of the global time slot S. The node outputs data in a private time slot (preferably in the next time slot) which is assigned to it, by which data it identifies itself to other nodes.

The outputting of the synchronization signal and of the data that identifies the node is repeated in the subsequent time slot cycles. That is to say the node outputs a synchronization signal in each global time slot S, and outputs data which identifies it in the respective one (preferably in the first) of the private time slots assigned to it of each time slot cycle. [emphasis added by Applicant]

Applicant believes that none of the cited **MESSENGER, DILLON** or **SAMOYLENKO** references teach or suggest, among other limitations of Applicant's claims, a respective node wishing to synchronize with one or more of the other nodes outputting the synchronization signal and further data which identifies the respective node in a time slot assigned to the respective node after outputting the synchronization signal or receiving

Applic. No. 09/897,279  
Response Dated October 2, 2006  
Responsive to Office Action of May 31, 2006

the synchronization signal from another one of said nodes, as required by Applicant's claims.

It is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 5 and 14. Claims 1, 5 and 14 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claims 1 or 5.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 3, 5 - 6 and 8 - 15 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Additionally, please consider the present as a petition for a one (1) month extension of time, and please provide a one (1) month extension of time, to and including, October 2, 2006 to respond to the present Office Action.

Applic. No. 09/897,279  
Response Dated October 2, 2006  
Responsive to Office Action of May 31, 2006

The extension fee for response within a period of one (1) month pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of \$120.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please provide any additional extensions of time that may be necessary and charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
For Applicant

Kerry P. Sisselman  
Reg. No. 37,237

October 2, 2006

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101